

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/709,631	TAKAGI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	M. Safavi	3673	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) M. Safavi. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David Dorton. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 February 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Meyers et al. '439; JP11-182029; JP9-151602.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**MICHAEL SAFAVI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 354**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dorton had argued that one of ordinary skill in the form panel art would not view the proposed modification set forth in the final Office action as creating a hollow projection extending along either side panel sections. Examiner had stated that such proposed modification creating such hollow projections is tenable and that forming the panel of Meyers as a hollow form panel would create such hollow projections along the respective side panels. Examiner had indicated that Applicant may wish to amend the claim language to more specifically define the "hollow projections", (i.e., insert language fully defining the specific features of the hollow projections versus the side panel), as is shown for example, in Fig. 9 of the instant application. Mr. Dorton has indicated that such amendment may be submitted in response to the final rejection. .